Meeting Minutes

Ad-Hoc meeting for WorldCom CR SCR082302-01EX

Wednesday September 11, 2002 @ 11:00 a.m.
Bridge Call open to all CLECs

INTRODUCTION

This meeting was held to discuss the questions raised around WorldCom's exception request SCR082302-01EX.

ATTACHMENTS

The list of associated Attachments is as follows:

Attachment A — List of Attendees

MEETING MINUTES

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Michael Buck/Qwest — held roll call and reviewed all of the participants that were on the conference bridge. Everyone in the room announced themselves. Michael stated that the purpose for this ad hoc meeting was to discuss the questions raised regarding WorldCom's exception request. He provided a brief overview of the CR and he pointed to the notice that went out with the questions and answers. The questions:

1. More details provided by Qwest to better understand if this change request is approved, what would be the end result impact?

   ❖ What in addition to timeline changes (disclosure documentation requirements) does Qwest believe will apply?

   ❖ What is the progress to date surrounding these CRs? "Migrate as specified" business development requirements should have begun as of July 26, 2002.

   ❖ Did Qwest account for the fact that migrate as specified functionality existed prior to IMA 6.0 when estimating its man-hours? Has there been any analysis performed on "migrate by TN" (synergies?). Are the man-hours established for "migrate by TN" still considered appropriate?

   ❖ How would Qwest resources be diverted

   ❖ How would the 12.0 prioritization list be impacted

   ❖ What additional man hours would be estimated

2. What "voting" standard must apply (2/3rds or unanimous)

   ❖ Is it possible to treat the CRs separately given their 12.0 ranking status?

❖ Example: "migrate as specified" will be implemented in April/03, would only "timeline" changes apply?, thus 2/3rds vote

3. What other options are available to address the Exception CR and lessen the impact on the 12.0 release?

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Reviewed the analysis that was done in answer to the questions that were submitted by WorldCom. He noted the 2 CRs that WorldCom has asked to have accelerated. Jeff spoke to the high level points included in the detailed feedback Qwest had provided.

He noted that both CRs are CLEC impacting candidates that affect GUI & EDI, therefore the activities associated with a major release must be done. Therefore, this leads to the need for a major IMA release. Qwest looked at the schedule and determined that the development process is too far along the path for IMA 11.0 to get these two CRs included in the IMA 11.0 release so Qwest ruled that out. Qwest has a point release (IMA 11.1) scheduled for January. The most doable thing would be to convert the planned point release to a major release, leave it in January, and do required additional activity that is associated with a major release (including SATE). Qwest would probably deliver SATE in conjunction, in January because of the schedule. If Qwest and the CLECs can't agree to do that, then Qwest could push the new major release out to February and deliver SATE in January. Because the request is to have it done by December, Qwest evaluated the possibility of the January date. Regardless of the date, scheduling a new, accelerated major release has the following implications:

1. This would produce a short schedule for Qwest and CLECs. If CLECs want to benefit from this acceleration, they would have to do work to assume those benefits.

2. The acceleration of candidates carries its own risks. The development scheduled is shortened by 2 months. If something goes wrong, Qwest doesn't have as much time to recover as there would be on an April delivery schedule, causing Qwest not to deliver on time. He noted that it's just risky.

3. All the documentation would be less than the 73-day requirement. Because of the short, aggressive timeline, Qwest probably wouldn't be able to make the 73 days for technical specs. The DRAFT specs would probably come out at the time the finals would normally come out.

4. Training on 11.0 will have just been delivered. More training schedules will have to be released. There will probably be some overlap causing back-to-back training.

5. Resources would be taken away from 12.0 in order to meet the acceleration. The candidates are using the high end of the LOE because of the nature of acceleration. Qwest doesn't have detailed numbers. Qwest did the estimates using the high numbers (Jeff reviewed the numbers in the response). In addition to the 2 CRs that get pulled up, Qwest and the CLECs would need to figure out which of the 2 CRs that tied for the #17 slot, would be eliminated from the release as well. Those are consequence for accelerating.

6. Impacts to CMP commitments: The CMP process requires that Qwest can't have major releases less than 3 months apart. This would be violated (either with the January release being too close to the November 18 release date for IMA 11.0 or a February release being too close to the April 7th date for IMA 12.0). So that CMP obligation would not be met.

7. Sunset impacts: The process states that Qwest will support the previous IMA release for six (6) months after the next major IMA EDI release has been implemented. Jeff Thompson/Qwest noted that the 3 hardware production platforms are only to support 3 releases. He reviewed the changes in retirement date for 10.0, and noted that we just received a CR to extend that date. He added that the WorldCom request would move shorten the sunset timeframe for 10.0 rather than lengthen it.

8. Noted that there has been a lot of churn on the IMA 12.0 release already. He indicated that CLECs have created issues around the prioritization process and that this is now the third exception on how the IMA 12.0 release should be handled. So far, there has unanimous agreement on how resources are to be used. This is causing lots of churn and exceptions for resources. Another way to address this would be to invoke the SCRP to get additional resources applied. As the CLECs continue to induce churn, Qwest continues to induce change in the way resources are applied to this release. This impacts issues that Qwest has to look at in dealing with this CR. He added that it is important to note that invoking the SCRP process would minimize the churn.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Noted that this is the initial take on an additional release. He added that both of the CRs in the WorldCom request are on different Business Requirements schedules for completion and that there has been no synergy identified between them. He added that once the specifications for the changes are completed, Qwest will revisit the LOEs to see if they need to be changed. He concluded by reiterating that this is the summary of Qwest's analysis of the impact of this CR.

Bonnie Johnson/Eschelon — Asked if Qwest could explain about how this would impact the sunset of IMA 10.0.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — Indicated the he has an interest in the IMA 10.0 sunset as well.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Stated that Qwest has 3 platforms. He explained that normally, in this situation, Qwest would run IMA release 10, 11 & 12 on those 3 hardware platforms. When it came time to run 13, Qwest would retire 10 so the hardware would be available to run 11, 12 & 13. So in that scenario, Qwest would retire IMA 10.0 when it is forced to go on 13. IMA 13.0 is currently scheduled for August, because Qwest needs time to prep the platforms.

Donna Osborne-Miller/AT&T — Asked if Qwest put the WorldCom major release in, then what would the sunset date be.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Replied that 10.0 might sunset as late as April. He added that Qwest would hang on as long as possible to the platform. He added that it might have to be March. And that these are all preliminary assessments. One thing is clear, it would not be May or later.

Bonnie Johnson/Eschelon — Asked if that would matter if it was the point releases.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Clarified that it wouldn't matter. The fact that Qwest has to create a new code base causes Qwest to change platforms.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Requested clarification around the concept of a major release. WorldCom views this request as a 'mini-major.' What would the impacts be for us as end users? She stated that the changes to CMP documentation would be against the 2 CRs only, and asked if that was right.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Confirmed that there would be documentation changes. But the impact would be more than just documentation. Qwest must assume that if the CLECs approve this then the CLECs must want to use it. In order to use it they would need disclosure, they need to be able to test, etc. He noted that if the CLECs want to do this, the CLECs must want to use it early.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Stated that her point is that it's not truly a major release because it's not 40,000 hours of coding changes. She noted that because Qwest is using a point release, the functional changes that exist are only based on 2 CRs.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Clarified that he was not suggesting Qwest use a point release. He was saying that Qwest could abolish the point release to use the timeslot for the major release. He noted that the definition of major versus point doesn't hinge on LOE, it hinges on level of CLEC impact. The question is whether CLECs would need to make code changes, need a test environment, etc. Adding that if the CLECs are looking at that definition, then the answer is clearly yes, it's a major release.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Indicated that she did understand what Jeff Thompson was saying, but that this release would not be adding any other functional changes but these 2 CRs.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Jeff confirmed that the proposed major release would be for delivery of the 2 CRs in question. Delivery of the functionality for these 2 CRs and all the related activities would constitute a major release.

Donna Osborne-Miller/AT&T — Asked if it would be a major release because of coding impact?

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Confirmed that she was correct.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Confirmed that there would be no coding or functionality changes with the currently scheduled point release.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Clarified that there is one spillover candidate disclosed as part of the major release, and added that there is no coding impact with that change.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Asked that if this Exception CR was approved, would there be coding changes required for the other CLECs.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Confirmed that there would be.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Asked about the comment in Qwest's feedback concerning the 40,000 hours. Qwest will most likely be able to address the top 19 CRs? Does that mean that #19 is going to make it in the IMA 12.0 release?

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Indicated that it is too early in the process to say. He indicated that for now Qwest needs to plan as if Qwest is going to make it all the way through #19 on the CR prioritization list. He noted that the process is to complete requirements analysis and communicate that in the packaging discussion in November this year. He added that Qwest would continue with design, then begin code, then provide the final commitment in December.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Indicated that she has played the numbers game and didn't know how Qwest believes they can get to #19.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Reiterated that this goes back to the way the process is worked. From a process standpoint Qwest must define further down the CR prioritization list than we estimate we will actually get. By doing this, we might find synergies with candidates further down. Also, we might re-LOE some CRs, causing candidates to go higher or lower on the list. It's early in the process, but at this stage, Qwest has to work this list as if this will make it into the release. In November Qwest will bring the results forward to discuss exactly what can make it in the release and why. He noted that right now Qwest has to work it as if it could make the release.

Donna Osborne-Miller/AT&T — Mentioned that Liz (Balvin) had concerns about this prior to today. She noted that the Migrate as specified CR existed prior to IMA 6.0. She asked what had happened that caused the CMP process to lose that.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Stated that we have had that detailed conversation before in a Monthly Meeting. At a high level, he recapped that there were a series of issues, some concerns around converting the wrong account, adding/deleting the wrong feature, and a whole serious of issues between Qwest & the CLECs, that lead Qwest to beef up how those conversions were done. The result is that more information is required from the CLECs to ensure those service issues did not occur. He added that it morphed into what Qwest believes is the higher quality implementation that exists today.

Donna Osborne-Miller/AT&T — Noted that she didn't know if a CR came forward in between then and now to change this?

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Clarified that it was a whole series of smaller CRs that morphed the capability.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — Asked if we clarify that this alters timeframes, would the vote be unanimous or two-thirds?

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Responded that he didn't think the analysis dictated whether it would be unanimous or 2/3. However, he did point out that the analysis shows this Exception Request would change more than just timelines, this would have broader impacts to CMP. Additionally, it would overturn 2 other Exception CRs that were agreed to with the unanimous vote.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — Indicated that in order to be prepared for next week's vote, we need to know how the voting would be handled.

Donna Osborne-Miller/AT&T — Asked for clarification on which 2 unanimously approved Exception CRs would be overturned by the current WorldCom Exception CR.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Clarified the two CRs to be overturned: 1) Qwest exception CR regarding full LSOG versus 50/50 and 2) WorldCom exception that sought prioritized 12.0 list versus 50/50. He indicated that there is a different resource issue for 12.0. He referred to the churn issue that he was talking about earlier.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — Asked how the CLEC community would go about making the decision.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Stated that she thinks it is important for WorldCom in dealing with IMA 12.0. She recapped that Qwest came forth to say they wanted the 50/50 option. WorldCom wanted another option and submitted a CR. Looking at the end result, we weren't going to get more functionality for LSOG and it was unanimously voted to keep the list as is. This third Exception CR came as a result of information Qwest provided to the FCC, per section 16, that a CLEC could use this process to request expedited treatment of the release. WorldCom understood this to allow for a change request to change timelines. If you look at the correspondence between Qwest and WorldCom, it will change a lot more than timelines. On one side Qwest is saying this is an option, to the FCC, when WorldCom submits the changes, it truly is not an option, we've been told the real option is SCRP.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Indicated that the exception process truly is an option. He noted that it is a fact of this particular case, that it might not be a good option because of the impacts. He noted that he could envision other circumstances where it is a good option. The process is there, and it is worth the attempt and it allows the discussion to take place. Qwest has brought forward how we analyzed this. The objection in this case, it seems, is with the outcome. If a CR was submitted to change IMA 19, for example, that would probably work because there is enough lead-time. It's not a problem with the process; it's this specific CR.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Stated that she thought that it was unrealistic to change IMA 19. Noting that it's so far down the pipeline.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Commented that he didn't intend a trivial example. The point is that the exception process exists and it works. He noted that with Exception CRs that Qwest had dealt with before, for example: the sunset dates for extending the process, that those CRs had worked.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Stated that this proves the point that WorldCom's original exception CR cannot be implemented regardless if there is a vote, and that it was evidenced by the correspondence that has been going back and forth. The original intention of the WorldCom CR can't be met. She noted that there's no vote that can change that. It looks like what's on the table is to shift 11.1 candidates and divert the 12.0 resources. It looks like they will implement both by the April timeframe.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Noted that Qwest is working under that assumption today. He added that Qwest can in no way commit to that. He stated that the process says Qwest will deal with that at packaging. Both are in requirements definition, both will be examined and Qwest will get back to the CLECs at the appropriate time according to CMP.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Asked if that is in November.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Confirmed that it was.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Asked if the soonest Qwest can do it is with the Jan/Feb proposal. She noted that the CLECs would be faced with all the impacts documentation, training, SATE, sunset.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest — Confirmed that with current assumptions that was correct.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Asked, where do we sit? She stated that it sounds like our exception CR has been rejected, I need to understand what Qwest's thought is. What's the vote?

Michael Buck/Qwest — Stated that he thought it's not Qwest's decision alone, it's a community decision. He stated that from a process standpoint, it would seem that the decision is whether to treat the CR as an exception. He asked what other CLECs thought.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — Indicated that if these 2 CRs are implemented as Jeff Thompson/Qwest has attempted to outline, it would result in another release. What affected Allegiance is the sunset of IMA 10.0 a month earlier because he had planned to request to extend this at least 6-8 weeks later.

Donna Osborne-Miller/AT&T — Noted that the whole year's planning is critical to an EDI development person, as well as all of the CMP development deliverables.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Explained that WorldCom didn't want to change the whole CMP to accommodate these CRs. She noted that WorldCom believed the functionality is critical to their business. She stated that this falls back on the process. It seems that Qwest is rejecting the request. She noted that if the group does move forward with the exception CR, it is not as it was originally intended.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Stated that he didn't think Qwest shares the view that the CR is being rejected. The process calls for voting on whether or not to treat the CR as an Exception. The CMP could still vote to treat this as an exception request if WorldCom wishes to do so, noting also that Qwest has outlined the implications and offered alternatives.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — Clarified that a vote of "yes" is that these would be implemented on December 31, 2002. He indicated that the inclusion of a specified date on the exception didn't seem appropriate at this time. He also clarified that there would be no vote at today's meeting. The vote was planned for next Thursday's CMP Meeting.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Agreed with that. He stated that is why Qwest believes that the vote should be on whether to treat the CR as an exception. He noted that WorldCom has the option, under the process, to adjust their request in light of new information. Additionally, regardless of when this CR might be done (i.e. December, January, or February) it would still impact the sunset timelines.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — stated that this exception has to be unanimous.

Donna Osborne-Miller/AT&T — Agreed.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Stated that Qwest also agreed.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Noted that she thought the vote option that WorldCom has put on the table has changed.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — Clarified that the change was from December to February.

Connie Winston/Qwest — Noted that it would be February if Qwest has to adhere to the SATE implementation in January. She stated that Qwest was going to take a one-moment break from the call to discuss the issue.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Stated that Qwest is trying to answer the question as to what the vote is that we go forward with. If WorldCom wants to remove or adjust the dates, Qwest can do that, or we can go forward with it the way it's written. Again, the question is whether to approve an exception to the process.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Stated that this will always happen. It's going to be an ongoing problem.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Stated that that's a result of the process that's been agreed to.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Replied that she doesn't believe that the option that was provided to the FCC is truly an option.

Connie Winston/Qwest — Responded that the Exception process is certainly always an option. She noted that it's the specifics of a particular CR that drives its feasibility. Adding that it's not that Qwest doesn't want to look at the options. She noted that sometimes it will work.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Stated that it seems Qwest cannot accept the original request. So going forward, does Qwest rejects this CR, or do you expect Qwest to change the CR?

Bonnie Johnson/Eschelon — recalled that there was one of these a couple of months ago. She noted that we did collectively agree that since Qwest was unable to meet the original request that the CR be denied.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Clarified that the one Bonnie was thinking of was not an exception request.

Bonnie Johnson/Eschelon — Agreed with Michael that the previous example was not an Exception. She stated that she thought there was another CR like this that was discussed.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Stated that she did recall that too and that she thought that was what we're faced with today.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Stated that he thought the example we are looking for here is the Covad exception where Qwest was requested to move the sunset date beyond a date that Qwest could accommodate. After consultation between Covad and Qwest, Covad changed the date in their Exception CR and the CR was unanimously accepted.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — Stated that we need to vote on weather to accept this as an exception CR.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Stated that Qwest agrees and believes we are voting on whether or not to treat this as an exception.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Explained that the WorldCom CR is requesting a specific date and that Qwest is saying that it can't meet the date.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Mentioned that if WorldCom choose to go forward with it as an exception, Qwest is prepared to vote on is whether to treat this as an exception. He stated that he believed that the question goes to all the CLECs. Qwest was asked to examine the risks and had done so. Based on the feedback and impacts Qwest has identified, Qwest and the CLECs need to decide whether there is a desire to consider this request as an exception to the process. Determining whether the impacts are acceptable, regardless of the date, is the purpose of voting whether to treat the CR as an exception.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Stated that the key is that Qwest is asking WorldCom to remove the date.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Stated the he didn't believe that Qwest was asking WorldCom to remove the date. He noted that the interpretation that Qwest has is that we need to decide on whether to move forward with this as an exception. According to the process, if the vote is in favor, a schedule for subsequent activities would need to be agreed to. He stated that he thought Terry Wicks had said it much better than he did.

Monica Avila/Vartec — Stated that Jeff Thompson had mentioned that Qwest felt that the changes could not be implement by the end of 2002.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Indicated that she had heard the same thing and it was included in the answers Qwest had provided to WorldCom's questions.

Monica Avila/Vartec — Stated that she didn't see that.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Pointed out that it was on page 9 of the CR response.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — Asked Liz Balvin if she was opposed to voting as it is stated? If we want to say yes, and we leave the date in there, then the exception either way passes or not. If it passes then Qwest will have to prove how they can't do it.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Stated that this would have to be a unanimous vote. She added that if a vote is taken today to see if we can get it in, it sounds like we are faced with taking a vote to move forward as it stands now. She added that a yes vote would say to implement the CR as it is written.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Stated that it's up to WorldCom. Qwest can conduct the vote on the exception as it's written, but if WorldCom chooses to change the language of the exception, Qwest can conduct the vote on that.

Donna Osborne-Miller/AT&T — Asked that if WorldCom changed the title, then this wouldn't be an exception CR.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — Responded by saying that if we follow the process, we have to vote on this, yes or no, to be an exception without altering the date or anything because the notice has gone out. The purpose of this meeting was to gather more information.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Indicated that if there was a desire to change the wording a notice could probably go out to the entire community with the updated wording. But, yes, Qwest agrees that there needs to be a vote on whether to allow an exception to the process in this instance.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Asked if the group had agreed that a unanimous vote is required.

Donna Osborne-Miller/AT&T — Confirmed that we had.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance — Stated that he also agreed.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Asked if we're saying it's unanimous because it not only changes the timeline but it changes other things too.

Donna Osborne-Miller/AT&T — Responded that it's because it's called an exception.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Reviewed the language in section 16. She stated that WorldCom thought when writing the CR that the primary impact was changing the timelines set forth with tech specs etc.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Replied that on this call, the group seems to have clearly established that this CR, per bullet 3, seeks to change more than timelines.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Asked Michael which sections he was talking about. She indicated that she still thought they were all timeline changes.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Indicated that Jeff Thompson/Qwest had already gone through the list in great detail. As just one example, he cited on page 9 the implication of having Major Releases less than 3 months apart.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Stated that she thought the group cleared that up that this is not a major release.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Stated that Qwest doesn't share that view. As it was previously discussed, the changes required by this exception meet the definition of a major release as defined in the process. He indicated that the view seemed to be largely shared by others on the call.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom Indicated that she did understand that this change would be a reallocation of resources.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance Stated that the changes would also be functional and require coding by CLECs, and that's another reason it qualifies as a major release.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom — Stated that she wanted to be clear that a unanimous vote is required and that a major reason is resources.

Everyone on the call agreed that this requires a unanimous vote.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance Clarified that for next week's vote we are voting yes or no on the CR the way it was written.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom Reviewed the wording in the notice and said that yes, the vote would be for the CR as written. WorldCom would not change the wording.

Michael Buck/Qwest Asked if there were any other comments/questions?

There were no other comments/questions.

Call ended at 12:25 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A

CMP Meeting Attendee List

Ad Hoc Meeting for SCR082302-01EX   **Wednesday, September 11, 2002**

Company Name	Full Name	Attendance	Phone Number	E-mail address	POC Type
Accenture	Powell, Mark	On Phone	(612) 277-0857	mark.r.powell@accenture	Primary
Allegiance	Wicks, Terry	On Phone	(469) 259-4438	terry.wicks@algx.com	Primary
Alltel	Dowding, Byron	On Phone	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	Primary
AT&T	Bahner, Terry	On Phone	(303) 298-6149	tbahner@att.com	
AT&T	Osborne-Miller, Donna	On Phone	(303) 298-6178	dosborne@att.com	Primary
AT&T	Spangler, Jonathan	On Phone	(303) 298-6240	jfspangler@att.com	
Eschelon	Cherminow, Todd	On Phone	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	
Eschelon	Issacs, Kim	On Phone	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	
Eschelon	Johnson, Bonnie	On Phone	(612) 436-6218	bjjohnson@eschelon.co	Primary
Idaho PUC	Hart, Wayne	On Phone	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	
Integra	Ambrose, Scott	On Phone	(253) 867-1063	scott.ambrose@integrate	Secondary
Qwest	Buck, Michael	In Person	(303) 294-1633	mjbuck@qwest.com	Tertiary
Qwest	Esquibel-Reed, Peggy	In Person	(303) 294-1658	pesquib@qwest.com	
Qwest	Foster, Beth	In Person	(303) 763-1839	bxfoste@qwest.com	
Qwest	Gallegos, John	In Person	(303) 896-2573	jigalle@qwest.com	
Qwest	Harmon, Jana	In Person	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	
Qwest	Maher, Jim	In Person	(303) 294-1636	jxmaher@qwest.com	
Qwest	Osborn, Sharon	On Phone	(303) 965-0436	sosborn@qwest.com	
Qwest	Owen, Randy	In Person	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	
Qwest	Routh, Mark	In Person	(303) 294-1693	mrouth@qwest.com	
Qwest	Stott, Sue	In Person	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	
Qwest	Thomas, Ann	In Person	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	
Qwest	Thompson, Jeff	In Person	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	
Qwest	Winston, Connie	In Person	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	
VarTec	Avila, Monica	On Phone	(214) 424-4406	mavila@vartec.net	Secondary
WorldCom	Balvin, Liz	On Phone	(303) 217-7305	Liz.Balvin@wcom.com	Primary
WorldCom	Dixon, Tom	On Phone	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	
WorldCom	Hines, LeiLani	On Phone	(303) 217-7340	Leilani.jean.Hines@wco	Secondary
WorldCom	Priday, Tom	On Phone	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	
Z-Tel	Reith, Michael	On Phone	(999) 999-9999	POC Data Unpublished	

The information contained in this report is based upon CMP Point of Contact (POC) data for CMP Monthly Meeting attendees who announce themselves on the bridge or who sign in on the CMP Meeting Attendance List.

Complete CMP Point of Contact (POC) information can be viewed in the POC reports available at
http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/poc.html

Updates to POC information (e.g. Phone Number, e-mail address, etc) can be made online at
http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/ppform.html

Report generated: 9/12/02 4:02:40 PM